

No. 10, Vol. V.—Quarterly.

APRIL, 1879.

THE ARMOURY A MAGAZINE OF WEAPONS

FOR
CHRISTIAN

PUT ON
THE WHOLE
ARMOUR OF
GOD THAT
YE MAY BE

ABLE TO
STAND
AGAINST
THE WILES OF
THE DEVIL.
EPH. VI. II.

WARFARE

CONTENTS

THE PORTRAIT OF ANTICHRIST, AND THE
RELATION OF ENGLAND TO THE TEN
KINGDOMS.

THE CHURCH OF CHRIST IN ENGLAND
ORIGINALLY PROTESTANT AND INDEPEN-
DENT OF ROME.

THE CONFESSIONAL DEFENDED.

PROTESTANT EDUCATIONAL CLASSES.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

S. W. PARTRIDGE & Co.
9. PATERNOSTER ROW. LONDON.

PRICE TWOPENCE.

PROTESTANT EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTE, 38, PARLIAMENT STREET, LONDON, S.W.

PROTESTANT EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTE,

WITH WHICH IS INCORPORATED

THE PROTESTANT ASSOCIATION, Established 1835.

For establishing PROTESTANT EDUCATIONAL CLASSES, and by Popular Lectures, Protestant Literature, and otherwise instructing the People in the Principles and History of the Reformation; for defending our Protestant Constitution and Institutions; and for opposing Papal Aggression throughout the Empire.

Secretary—REV. G. R. BADENOCH, LL.D.

Office—88, PARLIAMENT STREET, S.W.,
(A few doors from the House of Commons).

Contributions received from 1st January, 1870, to 15th March, 1870.

Received at Office:—

	s	d.
Allcroft, J. D., M.P.	10	0
Ayrton, Rev. J.	0	6
A. Lady, per Major-General Nuthall	1	1
Archer, R.	0	5
Bevan, R. C. L.	10	0
Braithwaite, E.	1	1
Brown, T.	0	10
Bantoft, W.	1	1
Bishop, Mrs.	2	0
" Miss	0	5
Bowles, R. C. S.	1	1
Brent, H.	0	6
Boyton, F. M.	1	1
Burnley, W. F.	0	0
Bousfield, C. H.	1	1
Bawtree, Dr.	0	2
Brigg, Rev. J. E.	0	10
Bouanquet, Rev.	0	5
Cherry, Miss	10	0
Crampton, Miss	20	0
Donation	20	0
" sub	1	1
Chittenden, Rev. C. G.	0	10
Cumberlege, Miss	2	0
Christ Church Library, Sparbrook, per Mrs. Buckingham	0	10
Christie, Mrs.	1	2
Chavasse, Mrs.	1	1
Colquhoun, Rev. J. R. C.	2	0
Cooper, Miss	0	4
Clapperton, Mrs.	5	0
Dennett J.	0	10
Danson, Miss and Mrs. Grant	1	10
Bade, Miss B.	0	10
Edlin, Mrs.	1	0
Flaming, Misses	2	2
Fox, Rev. G. T.	5	0
Grier, Miss	0	5
Gray, Rev. S.	0	5
Hope, J.	0	10
Hodway, Mrs.	0	10
Hall, Mrs.	0	10
Hassilton, Mrs. De Courcy	0	6
Hill, Miss J.	0	20

Received at Office, continued:

	s	d.
Henderson, Mrs.	0	10
Hunter, Miss	0	0
Harcott, Mrs. A.	0	5
Kennedy, Mrs.	0	0
Knigh, Mrs. E. B.	0	0
Leal, C. J.	20	0
Lancaster, Rev. R. T.	5	0
Morley, S., M.P.	10	0
McOlinlock, Sir L.	1	0
Martin, Miss F. W.	0	10
Marshall, Mrs.	0	0
Genl.	2	0
McSorley, Rev. H.	0	5
Mason, B.	1	0
Mallet, Cap.	0	10
Morrall, Rev. J.	1	0
Morris, A.	5	0
Morton, J. T.	2	0
Nuthall, Maj. Gen.	1	10
Price, Miss L.	1	10
Paine, W. D.	2	0
Post mark, Lancaster	0	5
" Crewkerne	0	2
Roberts, Mrs.	1	10
Rosborough, Col.	1	10
Shadwell, Mrs. L.	1	0
shaw, Mrs.	5	0
Simson, Mrs. E.	0	2
Smith, Rev. E. L.	2	0
Sheldon, Miss	2	2
Stokes, E.	2	0
Saunders, Misses	3	0
Sim, Miss	0	2
Towxel, Mrs.	1	0
Three Friends	5	0
Taylor, Miss M. A.	0	10
" Dox	0	2
" Shorthand	0	2
Vincent, J.	2	0
Weston, Mrs.	5	0
Wanchope, Miss	2	0
Whitfield, Miss	0	10
" From Friends	1	0
West, Rev. B.	0	10
Wight, H.	2	2
Wright, W.	0	10
Williams, J. W.	0	10
Webster, Miss W.	0	5
Wates, Mrs. H.	1	0

Received at Office, continued:

	s	d.
Special Parliamentary Efforts.		
Bazett, Col. C. Y.	2	0
Barbour, R.	10	0
Braithwaite, L.	5	0
Birks, Rev. Prof.	2	2
Cankrien, Miss	20	0
Cartwright, Miss	5	0
Cowan, Miss	0	10
Fale, T. B.	20	0
Ellerby, Mrs.	5	0
Evans, H.	5	0
Tripp, Miss	5	0
Hope, J.	20	0
Hooper, C. H.	2	3
Hignett, C.	1	0
Henty, W.	2	0
Hamblin, Cyp. G.		
de Courcy	1	0
Lancaster, Rev. R. T.	10	0
Mosely, Rev. T.	2	0
Niven, R. J.	0	5
Peck, Miss	2	5
Roberts, A.	5	0
Sutton, M. E.	5	0
Stevens, W.	1	0
Sheldon, Miss	1	0
Stokes, E.	1	0
Spencer, Miss	1	0
Steele, J.	3	3
One or two Protestant Friends	2	0
Wollaston, Miss	20	0
BLACKBURN, GARRINGTON, &c per Mr. T. O. Smith:		
Douglas, Mrs.	0	10
Fisher, Mrs.	0	10
Halliburton, Miss	0	5
Medwin, Dr. A. G.	0	10
Noakes, J. T.	1	0
Oliver, B.	1	1
Roberts, Mrs.	0	10
Shute, Dr.	1	1
BROOKES, per Mr. T. O. Smith:		
Bland, T. B.	0	5
Treay, Rev. F. F.	2	5

THE ARMOURY.

The Portrait of Antichrist.—(Continued.)

By the Rev. H. S. WARLEIGH, Rector of Ashchurch.

We gather, therefore, from the Apostle Paul that

XIV. Antichrist is an office-bearer in the Christian Church. Antichristianity takes its rise within, and not without the visible Christian Church. St. Paul describes it as a "falling away" (2 Thess. ii.), or an apostacy from the truth. If it took its rise from without the Church, it could not be an apostacy. In such a case Antichrist might be an enemy, but He could not be an apostate enemy, that is, once a friend, but now an opposer. We are not, therefore, to look for Antichrist among the Heathens, or Mohammedans : they cannot oppose a power with which they are not connected, and of which they know nothing. St. Paul, too, writes farther, that "he sitteth in the temple of God," which means, in New Testament language, the visible professing Christian Church, which, of course, must comprehend the true members of Christ's mystical body, whose names are written in heaven. "Know ye not that *ye are the temple of God* ? If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy ; for the temple of God is holy, *which temple ye are*" (1 Cor. iii. 16, 17). Here is an example of the professing Church at Corinth being called the temple of God. See also 2 Cor. vi. 16 ; 1 Tim. iii. 15 ; Heb. iii. 6 ; Eph. ii. 19, 20 ; 1 Peter iv. 17. Antichrist, then, is a member of the visible Church, bears office in it, and, as his name indicates, he is considered in that office as Christ's substitute. In fact, Antichrist must be some bishop, and some bishop, too, who is at the same time a temporal sovereign or king. If there is any one on earth who has possessed, and professed, supreme authority in the professed Church of God, he is the Antichrist.

XV. The forms of Antichrist's Government is similar to one of those which prevailed in the old Roman Empire. St. John speaks of seven heads or forms of Government in this empire ; five had passed away before his time, one was then existing, and another was to come. He speaks further that one of these heads was wounded unto death, but that afterwards his deadly wound was

healed. This revived head St. John afterwards calls "the beast;" and adds, that he is the eighth head, and yet remarks, what appears quite contradictory, that this eighth head is of the seven; but in reality there is here great accuracy, for he is the eighth in chronology, or as it respects the time when his government begun; but he is of the seven, or the seventh as it respects the form or nature of government. This seventh form was hyper-imperial, was introduced by Diocletian, and by its laws and customs the Emperor was treated with prostration and adoration. The eighth head is the rule of Antichrist, and as it is like the seventh, in fact the seventh revived, Antichrist is to be treated with the same adoration, and is to rule with the same sway (Rev. xiii. 8; xvii. 7—11).

XVI. In some way or other connected with the government of Antichrist, the colour of scarlet will be used, and become a prominent and observable feature (Rev. xvii. 8, 4).

LOCAL MARKS.

XVII. Antichrist ariseth somewhere within the limits of the Roman Empire (Dan. vii. 7, 8).

XVIII. But, to narrow the range, he ariseth among the ten kingdoms into which the Roman Empire is divided. Daniel observed that the little horn came up among the ten horns (vii. 8). In Dan. ii. 45, we read that those who are represented by the ten toes of the image, the same as these ten kings, should mingle themselves with the seed of men, that is, they should intermarry; and hence we are led to suppose that the actual number would sometimes vary. We arrive at the same conclusion from the fact that three of the ten kings were to fall before the little horn, yet there has always been a wonderful regularity in this particular, though the balance has occasionally been destroyed. But unless we can come nearer than this in finding out the place where Antichrist dwells, we shall not arrive at much certainty.

XIX. The seat of Antichrist's government is the very same as that occupied by the old Roman Emperors. We have already noticed that the revived head, that is the eighth in succession of time, but the seventh as to its governing form, sprang up in the stead and place of the head that was wounded unto death. This narrows the matter considerably, and points at once to the locality.

XX. But the place is specified as plainly almost as words could make it. The angel explains to St. John that it was some city which was built upon seven hills (Rev. xvii. 1, 8, 9). We may reasonably conclude that this city is not an obscure one, but one known and commonly recognized as having seven hills; and not only so, but one known as such, in the time of St. John.

XXI. Again: it is some "great city," which, at the very time the Apostle John wrote, was reigning over the kings of the earth (Rev. xvii. 18). Constantinople, St. Petersburg, Paris, London, were not in existence in St. John's time, and none of these has ever reigned over the kings of the earth, and consequently cannot be the

dwelling place of Antichrist. These two last marks put together make the matter so plain that it seems impossible to mistake.

MORAL CHARACTERISTICS.

XXII. Antichrist is a man. St. Paul calls him the "man of sin," and the "son of perdition" (2 Thess. ii. 3); and the Greek word translated "man," is such as can be applied only to those who are of the human species. We may fairly infer, therefore, that Antichrist is not Satan himself, though he comes "after (according to) the working of Satan." We conclude, too, that he is to be sought for upon earth and among mankind. The name seems to imply as much, for Christ was a man upon earth; and so Antichrist, whether a vicar, or an opposer, or both, is a man upon earth also.

XXIII. But this man is extraordinarily and preeminently wicked. St. Paul calls him (2 Thess. ii.) that wicked *ἀνὴρ*; that is the lawless one. His will is his own law, and he practically owns no other law, human or divine, as superior to his own. "He shall think," says Daniel, "to change times and laws, and they shall be given into his hand" (Dan. vii. 25). Again, "The king shall do according to his will; and he shall exalt and magnify himself above every god, and shall speak marvellous things against the God of gods" (Dan. xi. 36). So fearful is his wickedness, that St. Paul tells us "his coming shall be according to the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness" (2 Thess. ii. 9, 10). There have been and there are, and there will be, wicked men upon earth, but none so wicked as he, in his capacity, as head of the party he rules, and the system he represents.

XXIV. Antichrist is the great opposer of Christ. He stands on the other side over against Christ, and is the chief hinderer of Christ's true cause upon earth, the *chef d'œuvre* of Satan's workmanship, and the man of Satan's right hand. Jerome calls him *organum diaboli*, the organ of the devil—the instrument, that is, by which the devil works. St. Paul intimates that the devil works in him in the words "working," or inward energy, "of Satan." There are remarkable points of contrast between Christ and Antichrist, and a fearful parallel running between them. The invisible Father does not take flesh, but manifests Himself in His Son; so Satan does not take flesh, but manifests himself in Antichrist. Christ came showing forth the power of God; Antichrist came according to the working of Satan, and showing forth his power. Christ came to reveal the will of God; Antichrist to obscure it "with all deceivableness of unrighteousness." Christ came working miracles to prove the divinity of Himself and of His doctrine; Antichrist supports his pretensions by "signs and lying wonders." Christ, in a word, came to do the work of God; Antichrist to do that of the devil. Again: in Antichrist we have Satan's counterfeit and caricature of the incarnation and manifestation of Christ. The

very same words which are used to express the one are lent to the other : thus Christ has a coming, "with the brightness of His coming;" so has Antichrist, "whose coming is after the working of Satan." Christ has a revelation, so has Antichrist, "that man of sin be revealed," "that he might be revealed in his time," then shall that wicked be revealed. Christianity is called "the mystery of godliness;" antichristianity, "the mystery of iniquity." No wonder he bears the name of Antichrist.

XXV. Antichrist is a blasphemer. The greatest blasphemy is to put oneself in the place of God, and this Antichrist does. What words can be stronger than those of Daniel (xi. 36), "The king shall do according to his will; and he shall exalt himself, and magnify himself above every god, and shall speak marvellous things against the God of gods." To this the testimony of St. Paul remarkably agrees (2 Thess. ii. 4), "Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so he as God sitteth, in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." He allows nothing, whether true or false, to detract from his own greatness, or to stand in the way of his own glory. His object is the exaltation of himself and his own cause, and he makes every thing give way to this. "He opened his mouth," says St. John (Rev. xiii. 6), "in blasphemy against God, to blaspheme His name, and His tabernacle, and them that dwell in heaven."

XXVI. Antichrist denieth the Father and the Son. "He is Antichrist that denieth the Father and the Son" (1 John ii. 22). From these words some have supposed that he was to be an open and avowed atheist, but this is surely ingrafting a preconceived notion upon Scripture, instead of taking it out of Scripture; for other passages show that he is neither an open atheist, nor an avowed infidel. Daniel represents him as "honouring the god of forces, and a god whom his fathers knew not;" and, also, as "speaking marvellous things against the God of gods," which implies not only that he believes in the god whom he thus honours, but that he recognizes the being of Jehovah against whom he speaks the marvellous things. Nor can we take him to be a professed infidel; for, as we have seen, St. Paul teaches that he sits in the temple of God, and is a professor of Christianity. In our judgment, therefore, the meaning of St. John is that Antichrist shall practically and not theoretically deny the Father and the Son, and this interpretation of the word deny is borne out by other and similar passages of the Bible; which, as the subject is important, we will quote at length, "If any provide not for his own, and especially those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel" (1 Tim. v. 8). "They profess they know God; but in works deny Him, being abominable, and disobedient, and unto every good work reprobate" (Titus i. 16). But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them.

The persons spoken of in these texts—and there are many more—were neither atheists nor infidels, but professing Christians, yet they are said to deny the Father and the Son. The last text quoted is singularly to the point, inasmuch as those who bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord, are teachers in the Christian Church, false ones indeed, but still they are teachers; and this is just what we affirm of Antichrist, who, by office, is a teacher in the Church; but who, by introducing heresies in doctrine, and destructive errors in practice, contrary to God's Word, does in the Scripture sense deny the Father and the Son. This interpretation gains strength from two considerations—that when St. John wrote the above text, he had in his eye the Gnostics, who were professed Christians, though they had fallen into heresy; and also that Antichrist is called the son of perdition, a name first applied by our Lord to Judas Iscariot, who was neither atheist nor infidel, but a disciple of Christ. From all these premises we are impelled to conclude that the Antichrist of St. John no further denies the Father and the Son than the false teachers mentioned by St. Peter, that is, not in theory, but in practice. It seems marvellous that in this text alone an atheistic and infidel sense should be affixed to the word "deny," in direct opposition to other texts where the same word is used, and other passages where Antichrist is fully described.

XXVII. Antichrist is a persecutor of the saints; "I beheld, the same horn made war with the saints, and prevailed against them" (Dan. vii. 21); "and he shall wear out the saints of the most High (verse 28); "and it was given unto him to make war with the saints" (Rev. xiii. 7).

XXVIII. He is a deceiver, "Even him, whose coming is . . . with all deceivableness of unrighteousness" (2 Thess. ii. 9, 10); "he deceiveth them that dwell on the earth" (Rev. xiii. 14), and he is thus the means of spreading "the strong delusion," referred to by St. Paul. He has the art of cloaking his own real character, for he assumes the innocence and harmlessness of the lamb (Rev. xiii. 11); though when he speaks it is "as a dragon."

MISCELLANEOUS MARKS.

XXIX. Antichrist has not that regard for women which is paid to them by other men. "Neither shall he regard . . . the desire of women" (Dan. xi. 37). "The Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter days some shall depart from the faith, . . . forbidding to marry" (1 Tim. iv. 1 3). Jerome, in expounding the above words of Daniel, writes, "The better exposition hereof is to apply these words to Antichrist, for that he shall pretend chastity, that he may deceive many."

XXX. Antichrist promotes the use of, and belief in, protecting gods for cities, towns, and renowned places. "He shall honour the god of forces," Mahuzzin or gods protectors (Dan. xi. 38), see margin. In modern language we call them "patron saints."

XXXI. The number of Antichrist's name is 666, or, as it is

explained in the Douay Bible, "the numeral letters of his name shall make up this number." "Here is wisdom. Let him that hath understanding count the number of the beast: for it is the number of a man; and his number is six hundred three score and six" (Rev. xiii. 18).

XXXII. Antichrist professes to work miracles, "Whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders." The miracles are evidently false, but they are believed in by those over whom Antichrist reigns. "God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie" (2 Thess. ii. 9, 11). "And he doeth great wonders, . . . and deceiveth them that dwell on the earth by the means of those miracles which he had power to do in the sight of the beast" (Rev. xiii. 13, 14).

XXXIII. Antichrist succeeds in his wishes and designs. "The horn made war with the saints, and prevailed against them" (Dan. vii. 21). "He shall think to change times and laws: and they shall be given into his hand" (verse 25); "and the king shall do according to his will" (xi. 36). Indeed, the whole of the prophecies concerning him bear testimony in many places to this point.

APPLICATION OF THE PRECEDING MARKS.

We have now elicited some of the most important and prominent marks of Antichrist which the Scripture affords, and we shall proceed to show the application of them to the Pope of Rome. We would only first remark, that they belong to him in his official capacity. Some of the Popes, since the beginning of the sixth century, as well as before, may have been amiable and moral men in their private and individual character; but this does not touch the question before us; for it is the constant custom of the Bible to judge of corporate bodies and successions of individuals, holding the same place, in reference to their public and official character. We know that some of the Sovereigns of the Chaldean, Persian, Grecian, and Roman Empires, were outwardly excellent men in private life; but they were the heads and leaders of systems that were opposed to God and His people, and in God's Word they are judged of accordingly. So with the succession of Popes: we have not to deal with them as men, but as the avowed and acknowledged heads, leaders, and upholders of the system which they represent. In this capacity all the aforementioned marks most accurately and wonderfully meet in him; and, therefore, it is that we assert that the succession of Popes is Antichrist; or that each Pope, as he succeeds to the pontifical office, is Antichrist.

"The mystery of iniquity," or, "the spirit of Antichrist," existed in the days of St. Paul and St. John; but the time of its development and embodiment had not arrived, and the Church was not sufficiently degenerated to receive the pretensions and heresies of the man of sin. Hence we read of an apostacy which should precede his coming and be preparative to it. There was, too, a withholding cause that he might be revealed in his time, and not before.

In conjecturing what this hindrance was, the following obvious considerations will guide us to some conclusion:—

1. It existed in St. Paul's time.
2. Its interest was different from that which was hindered by it; otherwise the one would not, we may suppose, have hindered the other, but the two would have amalgamated.
3. There were weighty reasons why it should not be specified in writing.

Now, seeing Antichrist was to reign over the kings of the earth, after having subdued three kings; seeing he was to arise about the time that the Roman Empire was parted into ten kingdoms, each having its own king; and seeing he was to introduce new laws and customs, it seems from all these premises to be pretty nearly certain, that the power of the heathen Roman Emperors was the hindrance alluded to; for while that was in the ascendant, Antichrist could not rise into power and reign, and this is confirmed by the fact that Antichrist was to take the form and the place of the last seventh head of the old Roman Empire; whilst it also fully accounts for the refusal of St. Paul to name the hindrance, as it might unnecessarily excite the alarm and wrath of the Roman rulers, and damage the Christian cause. Nevertheless, as St. Paul had, by word of mouth, told the Thessalonians what it was, we may suppose it was not lost to the Church, and it is remarkable, that the opinion here advanced was universally held by the primitive Christians. We give a few quotations supplied by Bishop Newton. Tertullian, expounding the words, "only he who now letteth will let until he be taken out of the way," says, "Who can this be but the Roman state, the division of which into ten kingdoms will bring on Antichrist, and then the wicked one shall be revealed" (*De Resurrectione Carnis*, chap. 24). Again, in his *Apology* (chap. 32), he thus writes, "There is another and more urgent reason why we should pray for the Emperor, and even for the estate of the Empire, and the interests of Rome; for we know that a violence of the greatest kind (which hangs over the whole world, and the end of the world itself the arrival of which threatens calamities horrible to think of) is kept back by the intervention of the Roman Empire. We do not wish them to make trial of such things, and meanwhile we pray that they may be deferred in favour of the continued duration of the Roman Empire."

Lactantius (*Book vii. chap. 19* of his works), after describing Antichrist in the words of Scripture, thus concludes, "This is he who is called Antichrist, but shall feign himself to be Christ, and shall fight against the Truth."

Cyril, of Jerusalem, after referring to the prophecies concerning Antichrist, adds, "This, the predicted Antichrist, will come, when the times of the Empire shall be fulfilled, and the consummation of the world shall approach. Ten kings of the Romans shall rise together, in different places indeed, but they shall reign at the same time. Among these, the eleventh is Antichrist, who, by magical

explained in the Douay Bible, "the numeral letters of his name shall make up this number." "Here is wisdom. Let him that hath understanding count the number of the beast; for it is the number of a man; and his number is six hundred three score and six" (Rev. xiii. 18).

XXXII. Antichrist professes to work miracles, "Whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders." The miracles are evidently false, but they are believed in by those over whom Antichrist reigns. "God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie" (2 Thess. ii. 9, 11). "And he doeth great wonders, . . . and deceiveth them that dwell on the earth by the means of those miracles which he had power to do in the sight of the beast" (Rev. xiii. 13, 14).

XXXIII. Antichrist succeeds in his wishes and designs. "The horn made war with the saints, and prevailed against them" (Dan. vii. 21). "He shall think to change times and laws: and they shall be given into his hand" (verse 25); "and the king shall do according to his will" (xi. 36). Indeed, the whole of the prophecies concerning him bear testimony in many places to this point.

APPLICATION OF THE PRECEDING MARKS.

We have now elicited some of the most important and prominent marks of Antichrist which the Scripture affords, and we shall proceed to show the application of them to the Pope of Rome. We would only first remark, that they belong to him in his official capacity. Some of the Popes, since the beginning of the sixth century, as well as before, may have been amiable and moral men in their private and individual character; but this does not touch the question before us; for it is the constant custom of the Bible to judge of corporate bodies and successions of individuals, holding the same place, in reference to their public and official character. We know that some of the Sovereigns of the Chaldean, Persian, Grecian, and Roman Empires, were outwardly excellent men in private life; but they were the heads and leaders of systems that were opposed to God and His people, and in God's Word they are judged of accordingly. So with the succession of Popes: we have not to deal with them as men, but as the avowed and acknowledged heads, leaders, and upholders of the system which they represent. In this capacity all the aforementioned marks most accurately and wonderfully meet in him; and, therefore, it is that we assert that the succession of Popes is Antichrist; or that each Pope, as he succeeds to the pontifical office, is Antichrist.

"The mystery of iniquity," or, "the spirit of Antichrist," existed in the days of St. Paul and St. John; but the time of its development and embodiment had not arrived, and the Church was not sufficiently degenerated to receive the pretensions and heresies of the man of sin. Hence we read of an apostacy which should precede his coming and be preparative to it. There was, too, a withholding cause that he might be revealed in his time, and not before.

In conjecturing what this hindrance was, the following obvious considerations will guide us to some conclusion:—

1. It existed in St. Paul's time.
2. Its interest was different from that which was hindered by it; otherwise the one would not, we may suppose, have hindered the other, but the two would have amalgamated.
3. There were weighty reasons why it should not be specified in writing.

Now, seeing Antichrist was to reign over the kings of the earth, after having subdued three kings; seeing he was to arise about the time that the Roman Empire was parted into ten kingdoms, each having its own king; and seeing he was to introduce new laws and customs, it seems from all these premises to be pretty nearly certain, that the power of the heathen Roman Emperors was the hindrance alluded to; for while that was in the ascendant, Antichrist could not rise into power and reign, and this is confirmed by the fact that Antichrist was to take the form and the place of the last seventh head of the old Roman Empire; whilst it also fully accounts for the refusal of St. Paul to name the hindrance, as it might unnecessarily excite the alarm and wrath of the Roman rulers, and damage the Christian cause. Nevertheless, as St. Paul had, by word of mouth, told the Thessalonians what it was, we may suppose it was not lost to the Church, and it is remarkable, that the opinion here advanced was universally held by the primitive Christians. We give a few quotations supplied by Bishop Newton. Tertullian, expounding the words, "only he who now letteth will let until he be taken out of the way," says, "Who can this be but the Roman state, the division of which into ten kingdoms will bring on Antichrist, and then the wicked one shall be revealed" (*De Resurrectione Carnis*, chap. 24). Again, in his *Apology* (chap. 32), he thus writes, "There is another and more urgent reason why we should pray for the Emperor, and even for the estate of the Empire, and the interests of Rome; for we know that a violence of the greatest kind (which hangs over the whole world, and the end of the world itself the arrival of which threatens calamities horrible to think of) is kept back by the intervention of the Roman Empire. We do not wish them to make trial of such things, and meanwhile we pray that they may be deferred in favour of the continued duration of the Roman Empire."

Lactantius (*Book vii. chap. 19* of his works), after describing Antichrist in the words of Scripture, thus concludes, "This is he who is called Antichrist, but shall feign himself to be Christ, and shall fight against the Truth."

Cyril, of Jerusalem, after referring to the prophecies concerning Antichrist, adds, "This, the predicted Antichrist, will come, when the times of the Empire shall be fulfilled, and the consummation of the world shall approach. Ten kings of the Romans shall rise together, in different places indeed, but they shall reign at the same time. Among these, the eleventh is Antichrist, who, by magical

and wicked artifice, shall seize the Roman power" (Catch 15; chap. 5, p. 211).

Jerome, commenting upon the very passage now under consideration, says, that "Antichrist shall set in the temple of God, either at Jerusalem, as some imagine, or in the Church, as we more truly judge, showing himself that he is Christ, and the Son of God; and unless the Roman Empire be first desolated, and Antichrist precede, Christ shall not come, *'and now ye know what withholdeth that he might be revealed in his time,'* that is, ye know very well what is the reason Antichrist doth not come at present. He is not willing to say openly that the Roman Empire should be destroyed, which they who command think to be eternal. For if he had said openly and boldly that Antichrist shall not come unless the Roman Empire be first destroyed, it might probably have proved the occasion of a persecution against the Church" (Works of Jerome, vol. iv., Benedictine Edition).

Jerome lived long enough to hear of the taking of Rome by Alaric, and in writing to Gerontia, he makes this reflection on it—"He who hindered is taken out of the way, and we do not consider that Antichrist approaches whom the Lord Jesus shall consume with the spirit of his mouth."

Chrysostom, too, (vol. ii., p. 530) thus writes, "When the Roman Empire shall be taken out of the way, then he (Antichrist) shall come; and it is very likely; for as long as the dread of this Empire shall remain, no one shall quickly be substituted; but when this shall be dissolved he shall seize on the vacant Empire, and shall endeavour to assume the power both of God and man."

Other authorities might be cited in support of the above opinion, which was the general one until Antichrist arose, who, of course, would not recognize his own features. It should be remarked, that all these writers lived before the breaking up of the Roman Empire, and, consequently, before the appearance of Antichrist, and their testimony is, therefore, the more valuable.

Having thus from reason, and the testimony of ancients, discovered what the hindering power was, it will be conceded that while it existed, Antichrist could not arise, inasmuch as there could not be two supreme powers in the Empire. Constantine, indeed, having built the city of Constantinople, removed the Court from Rome to that place, where it ever after remained, and this, in some measure, displaced the check to the growing greatness of the Pope. "Before the fourth century," says Dupin (History vol. ii., 288), "the Church, which had been continually tossed and troubled with persecutions, could never settle one constant and uniform form of government, nor celebrate the mysteries with the pomp and splendour of ceremonies. But when she was perfectly delivered from the yoke of tyranny under which she had groaned before, and was established by the authority of a Christian Emperor, she made rules and laws for the government of herself, and joined to the purity of faith the magnificence of ceremonies. It was in the

fourth century that the body of the Churches was perfected, and that certain rules were established for ecclesiastical decisions." After this, corruptions flowed in apace upon the Church. "The Bishop of Rome," says Mosheim (*History*, b. ii. part 2, chap. 2), "was the first in rank, and was distinguished by a sort of pre-eminence over all other prelates. Prejudices, arising from a variety of causes, contributed to establish this superiority; but it was chiefly owing to certain circumstances of grandeur and opulence, by which mortals for the most part form their ideas of pre-eminence and dignity, and which they generally confound with a just and legal authority. The Bishop of Rome surpassed all his brethren in the magnificence and splendour of the Church over which he presided; in the riches of his revenues and possessions; in the number and variety of his ministers; in his credit with the people; and in his sumptuous and splendid manner of living. These dazzling marks of human power, these ambiguous proofs of true greatness and felicity, had such a mighty influence upon the minds of the multitude, that the See of Rome became in this century a most seducing object of sacerdotal ambition." The Popedom was sometimes contended for with all the fierceness of warrior kings. Ammianus, and Gibbon after him, thus speak of this matter: "The Prefecture of Juventius was accompanied with peace and plenty; but the tranquillity of the government was soon disturbed by a bloody sedition of the distracted people. The ardour of Damasus and Ursinus to seize on the episcopal seat surpassed the ordinary measure of human ambition. They contended with the rage of party; the quarrel was maintained by the wounds and death of their followers; and the Prefect was constrained by their violence to retire into the suburbs. Damasus prevailed: the well-disputed victory remained on the side of his faction; one hundred and thirty-seven dead bodies were found in the Basilica of Sicininius, where the Christians had their religious assemblies." How lamentable was such a state of things as this, and how clearly does it show that that apostacy had begun and far progressed which Paul said should take place before the revelation of the man of sin. But the hindrance still existed, the Emperor still reigned. During the fifth century, however, the unity of the Roman Empire was broken, and its consolidation destroyed by the incursions of the Goths and Vandals, as related at large by Gibbon; and now the man of sin began to manifest himself. Still, obstacles existed to the full exercise of his power. The Vandals became masters of Italy, and held their Court at Rome; but as they were Arians, and persecuted the orthodox, the Pope intrigued against them, and Odoacer, their king, fell before him. The Goths came next, under their King Theodoric; but he, too, overawed the Pope, who could not be elected without his approbation, nor call a counsel without his consent. All the Gothic kings claimed and exercised sovereignty over the Popes of Rome; besides they, too, were Arians. All this the Popes could not endure, and this king, or

horn, too, was rooted up. The Lombards were the next conquerors of Italy, and masters of the Pope, and consequently stood in the way of his rising ambition. To get rid of this power, two successive Popes, Stephen II. and Adrian I., wrote to Pepin, King of the Franks, to come and fight their battles, which he did; and thus the third horn was rooted up before the little horn. "I considered the horns, and behold, there came up among them another little horn, before whom there were three of the first horns plucked up by the roots." "And the ten horns out of the kingdom are ten kings that shall arise; and another shall rise after them; and he shall be diverse from the first, and he shall subdue three kings" (Dan. vii. 8, 24).

Pepin not only conquered the enemies of the Pope, but gave him also their lands to be his patrimony for ever. The Pope had previously laid him and his family under great obligation by sanctioning their revolt from Childeric, King of the Franks, by absolving them from their oath of allegiance, and by anointing him instead. "The gratitude of the Carlovingians was adequate to these obligations, and their names are consecrated as the saviours and benefactors of the Romish Church. Her ancient patrimony of farms and houses was transformed by their bounty into the temporal dominion of cities and provinces, and the donation of the Exarchate of Ravenna was the first fruits of the conquests of Pepin. The splendid donation was given in supreme and absolute dominion, and the world beheld, for the first time, a Christian Bishop invested with the prerogatives of a temporal Prince—the choice of magistrates, the exercise of justice, the imposition of taxes, and the wealth of the Palace of Ravenna. In the dissolution of the Lombard kingdom, the inhabitants of the duchy of Spoleto sought a refuge from the storm, shaved their heads after the Roman fashion, declared themselves the servants and subjects of St. Peter, and completed, by this voluntary surrender, the present circle of the ecclesiastical state," which is called the patrimony of St. Peter. This donation was made by Pepin, A.D. 755, and confirmed and even enlarged by Charlemagne, A.D. 774, "The temporal dominion of the Pope was now finally established. The declaration of the prophecy had exactly been fulfilled. While the Empire of Rome was dissolving into fragments, and the ten predicted kings were rising out of its ruins, another power altogether distinct and diverse rose stealthily in the midst of them, and secured itself a place in the western territory of Europe. From the time of the last Emperor of the West, three dynasties appeared in succession, and wielded the sceptre of nearly the whole of Italy. Each of these, in succession, was overthrown and destroyed, and the overthrow in each case was effected by the direct aid and strenuous efforts of the Bishop of Rome, and ended in securing his dominion."

From that time to the present the dominion of the Pope has continued, though in these latter times it is waning away,

and as the prophecies have thus far been fulfilled in him, we have every reason to believe that those chronological marks, which are yet future, will also be manifested in him.

In the application of the official marks we need say but little; for none will deny that he claimed to be the temporal ruler of the states of the Church, or that he is a professor of Christianity, and is a Bishop in the Church of Christ. The secret, however, of his power consists in the fact that he assumes to be the vicar of Christ; that as such he exercises the power of Christ; that he has, therefore, a spiritual dominion over all kings and people of the earth, and that if any are not subject to him they cannot be saved. "The annals of Europe during a thousand years attest the supremacy, though not always unchallenged, of the Papal power, and the boundless authority, nay, the divine attributes of infallibility and judgment to which the head of the Church of Rome laid claim. The ten kingdoms into which the Roman Empire was divided gave their strength and power unto the beast, and kings became the vassals of a priest." "The ten horns which thou sawest are ten kings, which have received no kingdom as yet; but receive power as kings, at the same time as the beast. These have one mind, and shall give their power and strength unto the beast" (Rev. xvii).

The Church of Christ in England originally Protestant and Independent of Rome.

Rome's victims in England have been misled, partly through the plausible statements and arguments of priests, but chiefly through the ignorance of Christian doctrine, and of the history of their own Church and country. In the glare of abundant light, and in the midst of accumulated historical materials, the ignorance or stupidity of even educated men and women is almost incredible. But the fact is undeniable. Hence we have been requested to publish the following admirable tractate by Bishop Bromley. It was originally addressed to the students of the Normal College and the congregation of St. Paul's, Cheltenham, and afterwards published separately, but now long out of print. It will be specially useful to the members of our Protestant Educational classes. It proves in a very succinct form the antiquity and original independence of the British Church, and hence the innovation and usurpation of Rome.

The present position and attitude of Rome in these realms is such as to demand a peculiar notice. Encouraged by the defalcation of a certain number of the clergy of the Church of England, that ambitious Church has deluded herself, or wished to delude the world into the opinion, that England is become ripe to return to her communion; and for this purpose, with her characteristic boldness, she has attempted a policy, the like of which has not been dared since the days of the Reformation. She has parcelled out the land into

so many episcopates;* and in such a way as to imply that her own is the only true hierarchy. Of her intention there can be no mistake, for though we are now informed that the Pope had but in view the extension of spiritual privileges, which, as spiritual adherents to a foreign see, Romanists had a right to claim, we had to listen to very different language when first the manifesto of the Cardinal Archbishop was issued. No one who knows the views which Romanism takes of heretics can doubt what is implied by such expressions as your beloved country has received a "place among the fair churches," and "I shall continue to govern" (not the Romanists, but) "the counties of Middlesex, Essex, &c." Who that has well read the authorized Canons of that Church, and the bulls of the Popes in regard to heretics, can construe the recent movement which has aroused (so unexpectedly to herself) the indignation of the land, otherwise than as an act to proclaim the Church of England a non-existent thing, or as a purpose, *pro posse*, to correct her as an erring and wayward child? If it be argued that the terms of toleration allow to all the exercise of choice in religious creed, we reply that there is a *limit*, which recognizes the right of a foreign prelate to exercise spiritual jurisdiction over those who voluntarily proffer their submission, and which also on the other hand protects those who do not from insult, though it be only the insult of words, while it also secures to the Sovereign her civil claim to supremacy over every subject, Romish or Protestant.

Such being the bold and menacing attitude in which the Bishop of Rome looks to England, it may be a suitable employment of our influence to show you the utter unreasonableness of the claim of Rome upon the English Church. The claim of the Church of Rome stands distinguished from every other form of dissent in this particular, that while others assert to themselves the privilege of multiplying their converts, if they are able, Rome arrogates an authority over foreign churches, and would exercise it, if she could. The ground of this claim may be thus explained. I use the syllogistic argument adopted by her own advocate:—"All Christians are subject to the authority of the true Church of Christ; the Roman Catholic is the true Church of Christ;—therefore a Protestant is subject to the law of the Roman Catholic Church." To omit other testimonies we read in the creed of Pope Pius IV., that most explicit summary of Romish faith—"I acknowledge the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Roman Church, the mother and mistress of all Churches." Now, if this claim cannot be established upon the Scripture, we are authorized by the last book which it contains to resist it. The Lord Himself, whose Vicar the Pope professes to be, lays it upon us—"I will put upon you no other burden. But that which ye have already; hold fast till I come." One mode of resisting this claim will consist in proving that the Bishop of Rome never himself discovered it till some centuries afterwards; and surely

* Reference is made to what is called "The Papal Aggression" of 1860, when the Roman Hierarchy was established in England.

we in Britain are the last in Europe who should submit to it, if it can be shown that the English Church had a pre-existence independent of the Roman Church. Now I will establish *two* particulars. I will undertake to make it clear that the claim of supremacy was never allowed to Rome during the first centuries of the Church; and secondly that there existed a Church in England before the period when Rome challenged to herself such supremacy. Before this supremacy was demanded, no doctrine, redolent of modern Romanism, was known throughout entire Christendom.

I. In proving our first position, we begin with Apostolic days, and we ask whether, in Apostolic documents, inspired or uninspired, this claim was demanded or allowed on behalf of Peter. The Romanists urge the passage where our Lord commits the keys to that Apostle. This was emblematical of Peter's mission when he opened the door of Christianity to the Jews on the day of Pentecost, and afterwards to the Gentiles by the conversion of Cornelius. They also urge the memorable ascription—"Thou art *Peter*, and upon this *rock* I will build my Church." If there be a mutual allusion between the Greek word *Peter* (which is derived from a *stone*) and *rock*, we will pass over the harshness of the metaphor, which is made to denote supremacy and authority, and ask whether the conduct of the Apostles, as at the first Council held at Jerusalem (Acts xv.), shows that this interpretation was understood. How is it then that in much later ages, when the faith of Peter began to depart from the Romish Church, words addressed only to Peter should be claimed on behalf of Peter's successors in a sense which Peter never applied to himself? The sequel will show that through a much later age, even long after a deference began to be paid to the Romish Bishop, no writer dreamt of enforcing this interpretation. The early Fathers disagree in their exposition of it—some refer it to Christ, as though He pointed to Himself—some to Peter's confession, just uttered, while others who do apply it to Peter apply it restrictively to his Faith.

The Apostolic Fathers of the *first* century are five in number; but personally known as some of them were to the Apostles themselves, they did not learn from them this doctrine of Peter's superiority. Their extant works are translated by Bishop* Wake, and he who takes the trouble to read them for himself will be convinced of this fact.

If we examine the testimony of the *second* century we shall have the more abundant materials for the establishment of the same truth. In this century a dispute arose in the Christian Church upon the subject of the exact day when Easter should be kept. The Eastern Churches, like that of Ephesus, took one view; the Western, like that of Rome, took another. By the way, we may remark that the ancient British Church adopted the Eastern custom, and this bears a traditional evidence of its original independence of Rome. Now we learn from history that Polycarp, who was

* Archbishop.

Bishop of Smyrna, discussed the question while on a visit to Rome, maintaining in defence of his own custom that he had learnt it from St. John himself. The necessity of some uniform practice was felt, but amidst this diversity of opinion we find no claim set up by the Bishop of Rome to a Divine right to settle what was thought an important question of controversy. At the close of this century the dispute was revived, and the then Bishop of Rome refused to communicate with the Bishop of Ephesus and the other Eastern Churches, because they rejected his custom. And how was this proceeding regarded by all the other Churches, Eastern or Western, whatever were their views of the question in dispute? Protests, strong and indignant, were poured forth from all quarters of Christendom against so unjustifiable a stretch of power, and among those documents one has been preserved from the pen of the venerable Martyr Irenæus, which administers a severe rebuke for so unheard-of an assumption of authority.

Another century passes, and the *third* brings with it a fresh question of dispute; and it was this, whether those baptized by heretics should or should not be re-baptized. Cyprian, the well-known Bishop of Carthage, held the affirmative side of the question; the Bishop of Rome held the other. The latter, whose name was Stephen, not liking the decision of the African Council, excommunicates them, and the tenor of Cyprian's reply deserves attention, inasmuch as, though he was a well-known advocate of what might be called strict Church principles, yet he takes ground that is truly Protestant. Stephen had supported his own opinion, not by any pretended right of interpretation, but by a tradition, preserved, he said, in his Church, that imposition of hands was sufficient, and that re-baptism was improper. "But whence," answers Cyprian, "does this tradition come? Does it come down from the authority of our Lord and the Gospels, or from the Apostolic Epistles? If so, let this Divine and *sacred tradition* be observed. But *custom without truth on its side is only antiquity of error.*" I need not say how important it is to weigh, in modern controversy, this time-honoured sentiment; and to examine in what sense Cyprian used the term "tradition." The arrogance of Stephen is afterwards interpreted by Cyprian, as an attempt to assume to himself the character of a Bishop of Rome. Cyprian seems to say, "What is the Bishop of Rome, though he does live in a large and important city, more than any other Bishop?" I know that Roman Catholic writers urge that the question was afterwards decided in favour of Stephen, and that, had Cyprian lived, he would have acquiesced. But what of that? He would have done so, *not* because such was the opinion of the Bishop of Rome; but because a Council, duly constituted, so determined it. While the daring threat of excommunication of the African Church on the part of Rome was regarded but as an empty thing.

But it may be asked, is there no historical evidence that, at very early periods, considerable deference was paid to the Romish

Bishops? Of this there can be no reasonable doubt, and there is as little cause for wonder. From earliest times to settle questions of dispute Councils of Bishops were held, who came from all parts, and it was indispensable that *some one* should preside. Thus James, as we have said, presided at the Council of Jerusalem, mentioned in the Acts. Now Rome was the centre of the world, the mart and capital of the last monster empire. After the conversion of its Emperors to Christianity, of whom the first was Constantine,* the position of its Bishops would necessarily be one of superior dignity, as compared with other Bishops; and if, as we firmly believe, this accidental circumstance gave to the Pope his original eminence, and if such eminence were still to depend upon the *political* influence of the Roman States among the nations of the world, it would, on this principle, at the present moment, be small indeed! The precedence which was allowed to Rome was also allowed to the Churches of Antioch and Alexandria, upon the same principle. History indeed abundantly testifies that the theory of a Bishop's office was this, that it was two-fold; he had a charge over his own Church, and a joint authority with all other Bishops, when assembled in Council, for the settlement of controverted questions, over which whosoever presided was regarded as a *chief amongst equals*. However much it may be shown by Rome that her Bishops became Presidents by custom, it can just as easily be proved that their authority was no other than is justly due to such office. To this alleged custom, however—ceded it may be at first by courtesy and sufferance, we must refer that enormous claim, in after ages, of universal dominion, asserted by Pope Pius at Trent, and by that other Pope Pius, through whose recent Bull our Protestant country has had a network of Popish dominion thrown over it round to the centre from every shore.

II. We proceed to speak of the *original independence of the Church of England from that of Rome*. The Church of England is only three centuries old, as we are told. Remember what has been advanced and what is about to be said, and you can answer the caustic enquiry of the Church of Rome, "Where was your Church before the Reformation?" We have seen that the early Churches denied any supremacy over the rest in the third century. Long, however, before this the Apostles, if not St. Paul himself, upon the most undoubted testimony, evangelized and converted the old Britons. When St. Patrick came to Ireland, in the fifth century from Rome, he found, as Romish historians allow, an existing Church; and when, in the sixth, Augustine came to England, he did the same. It is curious that we are indebted to one of the first Bishops of Rome, Clement, for the assurance that St. Paul preached the Gospel to "the utmost bounds of the West," an expression, we know, used by the Latin writers to express these very isles. We know that Caractacus,* the old British king, was a

* A native of Britain.

fellow-prisoner at Rome with St. Paul; and that he was converted to Christianity; and upon the testimony of the British Triads, or ancient records, his family brought back Christianity from Rome. We know also that the first Bishop of Rome, Linus, mentioned in 2 Timothy iv. 21, was a Briton. The proof of this statement is so interesting as to deserve especial notice. Clement tells us he was the son of *Claudia*. In his epistle to the Romans St. Paul says, "Salute Rufus." This was A.D. 60. Six years later he says to Timothy, "Eubules greeteth thee, and *Pudens*, and Linus, and *Claudia*." Now we have here the remarkable witness of the Roman poet Martial, that this *Rufus* and *Pudens* were the same person; that he was married to *Claudia*, and that she was a British lady. How remarkably is heathen witness pressed into the service of Christianity exhibiting fresh sources of British evangelization! Martial was at Rome at the very juncture of the release of Paul and Caractacus, and as if to identify this British matron more unmistakably, he styles her as *Claudia Rufina*.* Although the records of the history of this Church are scanty, and come through unfavourable channels, there are sufficient notices through succeeding centuries to prove its entire independence and self government. In the second century Tertullian, in his tracts against the Jews, bears this testimony, "Those places of Britain which the Roman arms have not yet been able to penetrate are subject to Christ." In the next century Origen, A.D. 230, enumerating the victories of Christ, triumphantly sums them up thus, the power of our Lord and Saviour is both with those who in Britain are separated from our coasts, and with those in Mauritania and with all who under the sun have believed in his name." There is concurrent witness that during this century the Church in these isles was not only existing, but highly flourishing. In the third century her purity was tested by the fires of persecution, called the Diocletian. At its very commencement a fearful edict went forth from Rome, for the complete extinction of Christians throughout the vast empire. Our own earliest historian Gildas gives a most pitiable description of these sufferings in Britain, amidst which "the churches were demolished, the Holy Scriptures were burnt, the priests and people dragged to the shambles and butchered like sheep." St. Alban's, in Hertfordshire, is an existing testimony to these truths, deriving its title from the most eminent of the martyrs bearing that name. These persecutions were terminated by the proclamation of Constantine as Emperor of Rome, who was converted to Christ and was moreover a native of Britain. After an event so auspicious, General Councils became common, and the presence of British Bishops, if their presence can be proved, is an irresistible evidence that the British branch was fully recognized as a branch of the universal Church. And what are the facts? A

* *Claudia cæruleis cum sit Rufina Britannis Edita, quam Latæ pectora plebis habet.—Lib. xi. 54. Claudia, Rufe, meo nobis Peregrina Pudenti.—Lib. iv. ep. 13.*

sect called *Donatists*, who though not the first heretics, were the first real Dissenters, held views which were regarded as contrary to Catholic truth, and a council was summoned at Arles, by the Emperor. At this Council, which was held A.D. 314, we find three British Bishops present corresponding to the three British districts, York, London, and Caerleon, regularly summoned, and subscribing their names. In A.D. 347 the three Metropolitans were again present at Sardis, and again at Ariminum, A.D. 359. Meanwhile, A.D. 325, the well-known Council at Nicæa was summoned, where the independence of all national Churches was laid down, and *perfect independence of all foreign jurisdiction*. In all these facts we have the most undoubted and unintentional witness to the British Church that the validity of her orders was never questioned, that her form was episcopal, that her Bishops took part in the sessions of Churches, and helped by their signatures to ratify their Decrees and Canons. That the British Church was pure in doctrine may be concluded from the fact that the three last Councils were held for the condemnation of Arianism and from the express testimony of different contemporary writers. In the fifth century the heresy of *Pelagius*, a Welsh monk, had infected, not only British, but foreign Churches. The heresy consisted in denying the doctrine of original sin, which he derived from his intercourse at Rome with a disciple of Origen. This and the following century gave proof to the vitality of the British Church, for we find her in numerous Councils taking the most active measures for the suppression of this error.

(To be continued.)

The Confessional Defended.

In the *Contemporary Review* for the present month there is an article by George Cowell, F.R.C.S., entitled "Confession: its scientific and medical aspects." There is nothing new in the article, although the old arguments are clearly and plausibly stated. What is chiefly new is the boldness with which one of the most detestable and odious parts of the machinery of Rome and the Ritualists is thrust upon the attention of the public, as if it were an essential part of primitive and practical Christianity. Romanists and their allies are generally so well aware of the instinctive horror with which Protestants shrink from the idea of bachelor priests prying into all the inmost feelings and most secret thoughts and acts of maidens and wives, that they keep any defence of this part of their system in the background. Still, the matter has lately excited so much interest that we suppose they think they may as well attempt to brazen it out.

The argument of Mr. Cowell is chiefly the old fallacy of a sup-

posed analogy, in this respect, betwixt medical men and Christian ministers, and the following short extract will give a good idea of the scope of the whole article:—

"Many of the facts necessary for a complete diagnosis of any given case have to be ascertained by a system of interrogation. It may be readily supposed that in some of the more simple cases of indisposition, when the patient is competent to make a statement of his symptoms, the physician may be able to form an opinion on the case and to administer the proper remedies without the necessity on his part of a single question. But this is the exception which proves the rule. It is but seldom that the sufferer, even if medically instructed himself, is able to interpret the significance of his own symptoms and their relation to the derangements of his own body. The skilled interrogations of the physician often open the eyes of the patient to the existence of disease which he had never before suspected, or to the utter triviality of a symptom which had raised up untold terrors in his mind. The system of the interrogation of patients is a very important part of medical education," &c., &c.

Now, that there is some general resemblance between spiritual and temporal physicians it is unnecessary to deny; but here the analogy ends. To expand it into all its details and use it as a theological argument is simply preposterous—although were physicians prohibited from marrying, and bound together by secret oaths, even their case would assume a different aspect. But there are a number of clear and insuperable objections besides to any such mode of arguing. The Christian Church, unlike a company of medical practitioners, is an institution wholly of Divine appointment, and the question is—Did Christ Himself, or His Apostles, institute or practise anything so abominable as auricular confession? There is not a trace of such a practice in the Scriptures. The only passage ever quoted, "Confess your faults one to another," has evidently no reference to secret confession. Even if it had, it implies as clearly that the priests are to confess to the people as that the people are to confess to the priests. The whole theory, moreover, upon which the confessional is founded is in the teeth of Scripture, and the practice is notoriously part of the fore-doomed apostacy. The pretended priest, forsooth, sits in the confessional as God, hearing and forgiving sins! The very description given by the Apostle of the whole apostate system clearly applies to this: "He as God sitteth in the temple of God shewing himself that he is God." The pretence besides, assuming this to be his position, is that in order to forgive sins he must know them, and in order to know them he must be told them. But if he were really God he would be as able to know sins as to forgive them, and it would be well to test him first on the point of omniscience, before he is trusted on the ground of pretended omnipotence—like the old test of knowing the dream as well as the interpretation thereof. Besides, all the talk about the various symptoms of various cases proceeds on the assumption that the comprehensive remedy of the Gospel, "Repent and believe," "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved," is to be set aside, and that the pottering of the priests of Antichrist with their penances and pretended absolutions are to be substituted in its stead. The whole affair,

therefore, is subversive of Divine truth and of practical Christianity. Our Blessed Lord and His Apostles never spoke of such a system. They dealt with all mankind as alike suffering under the disease of sin. The various forms or aggravations of that disease mattered little. The general fact was enough, and with that they dealt addressing thousands. There was only one remedy, and that remedy was offered as sufficient for all who would accept of it. It was not, therefore, "Go into all the world as priests, for the old priesthood was gone; creep into houses and pry into the secrets of all hearts and families and pretend to forgive sins." But, "Go into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature."

All this is perfectly plain. On the face of the Scriptural testimony the Gospel without priestcraft is a remedial system. But Rome and her allies by their sophistry would not only blot out Scripture, but history also, if that were possible. Do we not know by the clear testimony of historical facts as well as of many converted priests who have abundantly tested this dark prison house of Rome that it is a shocking engine for searing the consciences and debauching the hearts both of priests and people? A great cunning and political engine for laying open all the secrets of individuals and families, and thus attempting to prostrate the world at the feet of an all powerful clerical confederation? If there is one fact more abundantly proved by history and competent testimony than another, it is this. And yet it is a sad proof of the depravity of human nature that all this is disregarded—that plausible but transparent sophistry is accepted instead—and that men otherwise able and women otherwise amiable are found to shut their eyes and to go blind into the polluting confessional, "as the ox goeth to the slaughter, not knowing that it is for its life." Now that a bold attempt is being made to palliate and defend this, one of the most monstrous of Romish corruptions, it is high time that all faithful ministers of the Gospel were warning and instructing their people in regard to it, and especially the young against the snares that are thus being laid for their feet. Let them be taught to shun the confessional by whomsoever it is set up and recommended as they would shun the pestilence. Once entered and nothing but a miracle can save them, for the idolatrous heart acquires a liking for that avowal of secret thoughts to man which is at first repulsive, and a dangerous satisfaction in substituting the pretended forgiveness of a fellow sinner for the pardon which God alone can give. Therefore, it is as true of the Romish harlot as of any other, without a signal interposition of Divine grace, "Her house is the way to hell, leading down to the chambers of death."

Protestant Educational Classes.

The classes of the Protestant Educational Institute have been eminently successful during the past six months. The lectures

have given much satisfaction in the localities in which they have been delivered. The examinations have been of a high order, and the papers produced prove not only the increased appreciation of the system of instruction, but also the satisfactory progress made in the study both of the history and principles of the Reformation. Classes have been held in such towns as Reading, Cheltenham, Worcester, Birmingham, Warwick, Leamington, Devonport, Taunton, Weston-super-Mare, the City of London and its neighbourhood, Brighton, and Chichester.

READING.

The course of instruction embraced the Rule of Faith, the Priesthood, Confession and Absolution, the Lord's Supper, and the Present Phases of Ritualism. The course of lectures was delivered by the Rev. Dr. Maguire in St. Mary's Episcopal Chapel (Rev. G. T. Tubbs). The examination was upon the course of lectures, and upon Dr. Blakeney's Manual of the Romish Controversy. The prizes were distributed at a public meeting in the Town Hall, on the evening of 25th February, Captain Cobham in the chair. The following are the names of those who obtained prizes :—First prize, £3, Annie H. Moxhay ; second prize, £2, Mary O. Cooper ; third prize, £1 and a book, Maud Webster ; and the following obtained book prizes, viz. :—Maria Bazett, George C. Lyne, Annie M. L. Mayers, W. D. Heelas, Helen S. Fletcher, Edith P. Moxhay, Charles J. A. Batstowe, Ellen Bazett, George Sneath, Edwin J. Stokes, Albert Fifield.

CHELTENHAM.

A similar course of lectures was delivered in the Parish Church (Rev. Canon Bell), by the Rev. Dr. Maguire. The examination was upon the lectures and Dr. Blakeney's Manual on the Romish Controversy. The prizes were delivered in the Parish Schoolroom, on the afternoon of March 20th, the Rev. Canon Bell in the chair. The following obtained prizes, viz. :—First prize, £3, Annie L. Butcher ; second prize, £2, Emily S. Parsonage ; third prize, £1 and a volume, Jeanie C. Spence. The following obtained book prizes, viz. :—To Violet New, Jane Bryant, Lucy Spence, Jesse Wright, Emma L. Bell, Emily Christian, Louisa M. Wright, Frances M. Abbott, Cathleen H. Graham, Beatrice K. Carnegie, Sara F. Pratt, Susan C. Logan, Meta Mackenzie, Alice O. Carnegie.

WORCESTER.

A similar course of lectures, for the local Protestant Association, was delivered by the Rev. Dr. Maguire, in St. Peter's Church (Rev. Mr. Wright). The examination was on the course of lectures and Dr. Blakeney's Manual of the Romish Controversy. The prizes were distributed at a public meeting held in the Mission Hall, St. Peter's ; R. W. Binns, Esq., in the chair. The following obtained prizes :—First prize, £3, Florence Margaret Reid ; second prize, £2, Miss Farmer ; third prize, £1 and a volume, W. C. N.

Mitchell; and the following also received book prizes:—To Catherine J. Allinson, William Dawkin, Louisa Thorn, Louisa Maund, Clara Grove, William A. Sauday, Anna White.

BIRMINGHAM.

A similar course of lectures was delivered by the Rev. Dr. Maguire, in St. George's Church (Rev. J. D. Dixon). The examination was upon the lectures and Dr. Blakeney's Manual. The prizes were distributed at a public meeting at St. George's Schoolroom, on 18th March; the Rev. J. D. Dixon in the chair. The following obtained prizes, viz.:—First prize, £3, Elizabeth P. Breay; second prize, £2, Ada Roden; third prize, £1, Alice M. Lock. The following obtained book prizes:—Albert E. Brown, Elizabeth Omblor, Frederick C. Pickering, Thomas Lane.

LEAMINGTON.

A course of Protestant lectures were delivered in the Congregational Schoolroom, by the Rev. W. J. Woods. The course was inaugurated by a preliminary lecture by the Rev. Dr. Maguire; the Vicar of Leamington in the chair. The examination proceeded upon the lectures and Dr. Begg's Handbook of Popery. The prizes were distributed, in the Congregational Schoolroom, Warwick, on 14th March; T. B. Dale, Esq. in the chair. The following obtained prizes:—Senior division: First prize, £3, Alice Maude Browne; second prize, Wylie's History of Protestantism, 3 vols., Emilie A. Browne; third prize, Pilgrim's Progress, Edward Davis. Junior division: First prize, Spanish Pictures, Lillian B. Browne; second prize, Italian Pictures, Kate T. Hopkins; third prize, Lives of the Reformers, Louisa A. Smeeton.

WARWICK.

A course of instruction was conducted by the Rev. J. Gibson, in the Congregational school, Warwick. The examination was upon the lectures and Riching's Protestant Catechism. The prizes were distributed at a public meeting held in the same place, on the evening of 14th March. The following obtained book prizes, viz.: first, Harry Jeffs; second, Janet Moffat; third, James Styles, junr.; fourth, William H. Briscoe.

DEVONPORT.

A course of instruction was conducted in St. Mary's Schoolroom, Devonport, by Lieut. Street. The subject embraced the Rule of Faith, the Sacraments, Transubstantiation, the Mass, Purgatory, Papal Supremacy. The examination proceeded upon these subjects and Dr. Blakeney's Manual. The prizes have not yet been distributed.

TOTTENHAM.

A course of instruction was conducted by the Rev. Hugh McSorley, of St. Paul's, in his own schoolroom. The examination proceeded upon the lectures; and the prizes were distributed in St. Paul's Schoolroom 6th February; the Vicar in the chair. The following obtained

book prizes :—H. O. Allbrook, John R. Goodchild, Sefton Starkey, F. Short, Ellen J. Groom, Georgina K. Starkey, Charles Groom.

NORTH LONDON CLASS.

A course of instruction was conducted by the Rev. J. S. Forsyth, the minister of the Caledonian Church, Holloway. The examination proceeded on the course of lectures and Blakeney's Catechism. The prizes were distributed to the successful competitors at a Congregational meeting held in the church on the evening of January 15th; the Rev. Mr. Forsyth in the chair, who presented the prizes in the unavoidable absence of Lady Kinnaird. First prize, £3, Ann K. Craighead; second prize, £2, Joseph Simpson; third prize, a set of Protestant books, Louisa Dewick; fourth, a set of Protestant books, Edith Anderson; fifth, "Ultramontaniam," Catherine McGregor Forsyth. A copy of Girdlestone's Christendom was presented to each of the remaining competitors, and a copy of Foxe's Book of Martyrs to the boys and girls of the Caledonian Asylum, to whom prizes have been offered by the Protestant Educational Institute, who stand the best examination upon this book.

Besides this systematic course of instruction, lectures accompanied with dissolving views, have also been delivered by Dr. Soutter, assisted by Mr. W. T. Gibson, in the Caledonian Church, Holloway, in the Caledonian Asylum, and in the Baptist Chapel, Finsbury Park. These lectures have been highly appreciated, and created much interest in the respective places.

The estimated number of students attending the Protestant classes has been not less than 5,000, and this important work might be much more extended over the whole country if increased funds were given to the Protestant Educational Institute.

Short Notices on Books.

The Ingoldsby Letters (1858-1878).—In reply to the Bishops on Convocation, the House of Lords, and elsewhere, on the revision of the Book of Common Prayer, by the Rev. JAMES HILDYARD, B.B., Rector of Ingoldsby. Fourth edition, revised and enlarged. London: CASSELL, PETER, & GALPIN.

We rejoice to see a fourth edition of these now famous Letters. The present edition brings down the facts and arguments with respect to the revision of the Book of Common Prayer to the present hour, and his kind friend Mr. Parker, of Hanthorpe House, to whom the present edition is dedicated, has rendered a great service to the Christian Churches of the land in specially requesting the re-publication of this admirable work, and defraying its chief cost. The two handsome volumes are adorned with excellent portraits of the author, as he was, and is, and we regret to observe that time is telling upon his locks. There are also two views of the Ingoldsby

Rectory, all giving interest and distinctness to the work. Those who enjoyed the "Ingoldsby Letters" when they first appeared will read again this edition with renewed pleasure. There are so many facts, and the arguments of so many eminent men, now passed away, that are apt to escape the memory; and hence the present edition, with the author's numerous notes, bringing the question down to our time, appears like a new work. And to those who have grown into manhood, and are now taking their share in public questions, the volumes will be an invaluable storehouse of facts and arguments whereby they will be able to carry on the discussion of the question, which cannot fail to end in a triumphant issue if they "be not weary in well-doing, and if they faint not." The classical style and taste of the writer are well known, and his pleasing banter, and quaint and apt quotations, all give a charm to our old friend, and make us almost think that the author is young again, and is renewing his strength and vigour like the eagles. We wish that some means may be devised to place a copy of the work in the hands of every student at our Universities, and in every Church library in the land,

The English Reformation: How it came about, and why we should uphold it, by CUNNINGHAM GEIKIE, D.D., author of *The Life and Works of Christ*, &c.—Second edition. London: STRAHAN & Co.

We have perused this work with much satisfaction. A concise history of the Reformation was much needed, and the author has executed his task with much skill and ability. The object of the work is well explained by himself in the following words, extracted from the preface:—

"One cause of the success of the Romish clergy in our Church has undoubtedly been the audacity with which they have maligned the Reformation and the Reformers, and extolled the Romish Church of the pre-Reformation period. There has been a want of reliable and easily accessible information on these matters, for Professor J. J. Blunt's sketch of the Reformation, written forty years ago, is still almost the only Protestant manual of a moderate size on the subject. To supply this defect is the object of the present book. I have striven to write it calmly, fairly and truly. No labour has been spared to make it reliable, and hence, though it will doubtless be assailed by the Romanists who have crept into English holy orders, the reader may feel confident in its statements. If Rome look the reverse of attractive, as described, it is to be remembered that even the temperate homilies of our Church are forced to denounce it as 'Antichrist,' for its abomination in the times of which I treat, and its un-Christian principles always."

We most cordially endorse these sentiments, and as heartily recommend an extensive circulation of the volume. Facts are arranged and stated in a clear and happy manner, and the whole is written with much literary ability and research. The volume

will prove a most useful text-book on the English Reformation to all students who desire to obtain a correct view of the struggles and real principles of our great Reformers.

A Protestant Text-Book of the Romish Controversy, by JAMES TODD, Examiner for the Protestant Educational Institute. London : W. T. GIBSON, 38, Parliament-street.

This volume just published takes up the following important questions :—The Protestant Rule of Faith, the Objections to the Same, the Apocrypha, the Right of Private Judgment, the Romish Rule of Faith, Infallibility, the Supremacy of Peter, the Supremacy of the Pope, and Papal Succession. The volume contains also in the appendix the Decrees of the Vatican Council, and other documents important for reference. We consider this is the best modern text book in the English language. It is short, thoroughly argumentative and exhaustive. It is admirably adapted as a text book for intellectual students, and senior Protestant classes. It will also prove useful to ministers of all Protestant denominations. This volume will be followed by two others by the same able author on other Papal Doctrines, and on The Bearing of Popery on the Social and Political Life of a Nation.

DISTRIBUTION OF PRIZES.

THE ANNUAL MEETING of the PROTESTANT EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTE for the Distribution of Prizes to the Classes in the City and West End of London, will take place (p.v.)

IN THE

GREAT HALL, CANNON STREET HOTEL, E.C.,

ON WEDNESDAY EVENING, MAY 14th, 1879,

At 7-30 p.m.

LORD CLAUD JOHN HAMILTON, M.P.,

WILL PRESIDE.

Friends in the country desirous of attending this interesting meeting will be so good as intimate the same to the Secretary of the Institute, the Rev. Dr. BADENOCH, 38, Parliament-street, London, S.W., who will be happy to forward tickets of admission.

Contributions—continued.

S. S. S.		S. S. S.		S. S. S.	
Newford, per Mr. T. O. Smith:		Oxley, per Mr. T. O. Smith:		Hartford, per Mr. T. O. Smith:	
Bond, R. T.	0 5 0	Smith:		Gilbertson, H.	0 10 0
Clare, T. F.	0 3 0	Bishop, Major F.	0 10 0	Hawke, A.	1 3 0
Crick, Dr. F. W.	0 10 0	Brown, Dr.	0 10 0	Kunn, Miss, Don.	0 2 0
Gules, Lt. Col.	0 2 0	Cockell, Rev. H.	0 10 0	Pratt, Rev. O. 2 yrs.	1 0 0
Hopkins, Mrs.	0 2 0	Coleman, Miss	0 10 0	Butter, Miss, Don.	0 2 0
Kim, Mrs.	0 5 0	Freeland, Mrs.	0 5 0	Spence, E. E.	1 1 0
Trapp, F.	0 5 0	Hanson, Mrs.	0 5 0	Woodhouse, Dr.	0 5 0
Trapp, J.	0 10 0	Hall, B. J.	1 0 0	Young, Mrs. C.	0 10 0
BURY ST. MARCOT, per Mr. T. O. Smith:		Knight, Miss	0 5 0		
Beard, J.	0 5 0	Walker, Miss	0 10 0		
Cartwright, Miss	1 0 0			HIGHAM, per Mr. T. O. Smith:	
Death, Miss F.	0 3 0	CROFTON, per Mr. T. O. Smith:		Jeeves, W.	0 5 0
Gibbs, W.	0 2 0	Adams, J.	0 10 0		
Hardwick, E. J.	0 3 0	Blake, Mrs.	0 10 0	HODDINGTON, per Mr. T. O. Smith:	
Harvey, Miss	1 0 0	Covell, W.	0 10 0	Marles, Rev. R. W.	1 0 0
Pick, Miss C.	0 5 0	Campbell, J.	0 10 0		
Paine, Miss	0 3 0	Foster, Miss	0 10 0	IVER & UXBIDGE, per Mr. T. O. Smith:	
Prig, H. Jun.	0 10 0	Kennard, W.	0 10 0	Allwood, Miss	0 10 0
Weston, Miss	1 0 0	Lowe, T. F.	0 10 0	Bastard, C.	0 5 0
		Maitland, R. S.	0 10 0	Ward, Rev. W.	0 10 0
		Rosier, Miss M. J.	0 10 0	Ward, Miss	0 10 0
		Thrill, J.	0 2 0	Webster, C.	0 10 0
		Townley, E. W.	0 2 0	Wilkins, A.	0 5 0
HUGLEVADE, per Mr. T. O. Smith:					
Frederick, H.	0 10 0	DOVER, per Mr. T. O. Smith:			
		Anderson, Mr.	0 5 0	IRWING, per Mr. T. O. Smith:	
CAMBRIDGE, per Mr. T. O. Smith:		Boyle, Lady A.	1 0 0	Dyles, Mrs.	0 5 0
Beall, G.	0 3 0	Farnley, T.	0 10 0	Morch, Miss	0 2 0
Bodger, A.	0 10 0	Flashman, G.	0 5 0	Reeve, Mrs.	0 5 0
Hiborne, H. G.	0 10 0	Griffiths, W.	0 3 0		
Jack, E.	0 10 0	Hill, E.	0 5 0	LEIGHTON BOROUGH, per Mr. T. O. Smith:	
Gray, T.	0 5 0	Kyda, Mrs.	0 5 0	Harris, T.	0 10 0
Harrison, F. L.	0 10 0	Lights, Rev. W. E.	0 5 0		
Horton, Rev. Dr.	1 0 0	Long, C. E.	0 10 0	LOTTAN, per Mr. T. O. Smith:	
Pain, J. Odell	0 10 0	Mowle, W. B.	1 1 0	Browne, H. G.	0 5 0
Porcheron, A. R.	0 10 0	Weston, Miss	0 10 0	Green, J. W.	1 1 0
Talbot, W. F.	0 2 0				
		CHESTER, per Mr. G. Thomas:		LOWES, per Mr. T. O. Smith:	
CANTERBURY, per Mr. T. O. Smith:		Aiken, G.	0 10 0	Smith:	
Flint, E. W.	0 5 0	Balder, A.	0 10 0	Worthington, C. W.	1 1 0
Morley, Col.	0 10 0	Ballard, Mrs.	0 10 0		
Smith, Rev. Payne (the Dean)	1 0 0	Cavill, Rev. G.	0 10 0	LENDON, per Mr. T. O. Smith:	
Warner, Rev. G. B.	0 10 0	Duke, W.	0 5 0	Adam & Broughton	1 1 0
Lee	0 10 0	Green, T.	0 10 0	Astle, F.	0 2 0
GRANTHAM, per Mr. T. O. Smith:		Green, J. G.	0 5 0	Barnes, Mrs.	1 0 0
Broughton, E.	0 5 0	Merrick, G. M.	0 5 0	Clements and Newling	1 1 0
Clay, Miss	0 5 0	Newland, Miss	0 10 0	Chase, Rev. G. S.	0 10 0
Devonish, Miss	1 1 0	Sales, J. C.	0 5 0	Edick, J. E.	1 0 0
Jenkinson, Mrs.	0 5 0	Turnbull, M.	0 2 0	Engall, Dr.	1 0 0
Meyer, Mrs.	0 5 0	Wyke, M.	0 10 0	Glen, Dr.	1 0 0
				Hodgson, E. W.	1 1 0
GRANTHAM, per Mr. James Todd:				Lawrie, J.	2 3 0
Bellay, Mrs.	1 0 0	GR. per Mr. T. O. Smith:		Proctor, R. Jun.	0 10 0
Bernard, W. O.	1 1 0	Lawton, G. W.	0 5 0	Todd and Proctor	1 1 0
Bell, W. M.	0 5 0	Pock, E.	0 10 0	Turnbull, B. T.	1 1 0
Budd, Geo.	1 0 0				
Chamberlain, Rev. G. W.	0 10 0	FATHERHAM, per Mr. T. O. Smith:		MAIDSTONE, per Mr. T. O. Smith:	
De Ferris, Rev.	1 1 0	Attwater, T. M.	0 5 0	Fremlin, Mrs.	1 1 0
Dyson, A.	0 10 0	Bethune, J.	0 5 0	Mercer, E.	0 10 0
Halliday, C.	0 10 0	Bryan, C.	0 5 0	Roberts, J.	0 10 0
Jordan, W.	1 0 0				
Lloyd, Miss F. M.	0 10 0	GODALMING, per Mr. T. O. Smith:		MARGATE, per Mr. T. O. Smith:	
Loch, Miss	0 5 0	Rea, J.	0 5 0	Blackburn, T.	0 10 0
Nichols, Mrs.	1 10 0			Cain, G. W.	0 2 0
Paul, A.	0 10 0	GRAVESEND, per Mr. T. O. Smith:		Speed, J.	0 5 0
Poole, Miss	10 0 0	Jennings, Rev. F. E.	0 5 0	Thunder, T. H.	0 2 0
Roper, E.	0 10 0	Pollard, W.	0 10 0		
South, Mrs.	1 0 0			NEWBURY, per Mr. G. Thompson:	
Saunders, Rev. J. T. C.	1 1 0	GUILDFORD, per Mr. T. O. Smith:		A Friend	1 0 0
Schreiber, Mrs.	0 10 0	Botting, E.	0 2 0	Barnes, G.	0 5 0
Shillstone, W. H.	1 0 0	Carter, Mrs.	0 10 0	Bentham, S.	0 2 0
Walker, Mrs.	0 5 0	Edmond, J.	1 0 0	Edler, T.	0 5 0
Wilson, Col.	0 10 0	Frederick, E.	0 2 0	Flint, Mrs.	0 5 0
		Harris, Mrs.	0 2 0	Gould, J.	0 2 0
GRANTHAM, additional, per Mr. T. O. Smith:		Herd, Mrs.	0 2 0	Hill, A.	0 2 0
Halahan, Mrs.	0 5 0	Hobbs, E.	0 2 0	Wareham, J.	0 5 0
Lyne, Rev. R. H.	0 2 0	Mayo, Mrs.	0 2 0	Wells, H.	0 2 0
Widdow, Miss	0 5 0	Payne, Rev. F.	0 5 0		
		Wallbank, W.	0 2 0	ROSWICK, per Mr. T. O. Smith:	
				Govett, Rev. E.	0 10 0
				Hinde, F. F.	0 5 0
				Hodges, Miss	0 5 0

Contributions—continued.

Nonwich, continued—		s s. d.	READING—continued.		s s. d.	TUNBRIDGE WELLS, per Mr.		s s. d.
Patteson, H. S.	...	0 10 0	Payne, Rev. W.	...	0 5 0	T. O. Smith:		
Spiley, Rev. W. N.	...	1 1 0	Phelps, Mrs.	...	0 2 6	Forbes, Hon. R.	...	1 1 0
Taylor, J. O. H.	...	0 5 6	Porter, Rev. R.	...	0 2 6	Key, Admiral T. B.	...	0 10 6
RAMSGATE, per Mr. T. O. Smith:			Papillon, Major	...	0 5 0	Smart, Dr. F. C.	...	0 5 0
A. P. S.	...	0 5 0	Philbrick, C.	...	0 10 0	Satchell, Dr. W. E.	...	0 5 0
Barwise, Miss	...	1 1 0	St. Maur, Lady H.	...	2 0 0	Steel J.	...	1 0 0
Blanco, J.	...	0 2 6	Shettle, R. C. L.	...	0 10 0	Trigg, J.	...	0 2 0
Day, Miss	...	0 5 0	M.D.	...	0 10 0	Wallinger, Rev. W.	...	0 10 0
Grant, Miss	...	0 10 6	Simonds, James	...	0 5 0	UPPER NONWOOD, per Mr. T. O. Smith:		
Henderson, T. A.	...	0 10 0	Simonds, Mrs.	...	0 5 0	Bonar, Mrs.	...	1 0 0
Lacy, Miss	...	0 3 0	Soole, Rev. S. H.	...	0 5 0	Macdonald, Lady R.	...	1 1 0
Ladd, Mrs.	...	0 12 6	Sutton, A.	...	2 2 0	Scott, Rev. T. S.	...	0 5 0
Moxed, Mrs.	...	0 2 0	Sutton, M. H.	...	2 2 0	WARE, per Mr. T. O. Smith:		
Page, Mrs.	...	0 5 0	Sutton, M. H. Don.	...	1 1 0	Collins, Mrs.	...	0 10 0
Pygott, W. J.	...	0 5 0	Sutton, M. J.	...	1 1 0	Campbell, Rev. D.	...	0 10 0
Spindler, Mrs.	...	0 5 0	Tubbs, Rev. J.	...	0 5 0	French, J. W.	...	0 19 6
HEAT HING, per Mr. G. Thomson:			Wilson, Miss	...	1 0 0	Gopsall, T.	...	0 5 0
Basett, Col.	...	1 0 0	Workman, Dr.	...	0 10 0	WISBEACH, per Mr. T. O. Smith:		
Basett, R. Y.	...	1 0 0	Workman, Mrs.	...	0 2 6	Littlewood, Miss	...	0 10 0
Boyle, Hon. R.	...	1 0 0	Young, Dr.	...	1 1 0	Scott, Rev. J.	...	0 10 0
Brew, Miss	...	0 2 6	Young, Miss	...	0 5 0	YARMOUTH, per Mr. T. O. Smith:		
Drewett, Miss	...	0 2 6	"	...	0 2 6	Argyle, J. W.	...	0 5 0
Dryland, R. C.	...	0 2 6	SEVENOAKS, per Mr. T. O. Smith:			Fellow, F.	...	0 5 0
Don	...	0 10 0	Palmer, C.	...	0 10 6	Mabson, W.	...	0 2 6
Fleming, Mrs.	...	0 5 0	Palmer, J.	...	1 0 0	St. IVN's, per Mr. T. O. Smith:		
Fletcher, Mrs.	...	0 2 6	St. IVN's, per Mr. T. O. Smith:			Adams, R.	...	1 1 0
Heelas, D.	...	0 10 0	King, W.	...	0 10 0	Pigott, J.	...	0 2 6
Hewett, R.	...	1 1 0	Pigott, J.	...	0 2 6	Sargent, T. B.	...	0 5 0
Hooper, C.	...	0 2 6	Wiph, J. B.	...	0 5 0			
Huntley, J.	...	0 0 0						
Hawkins, Miss H. A.	...	0 2 6						

Just Published. 8vo, pp. 342. Price 3s. 6d.

A PROTESTANT TEXT BOOK OF THE ROMISH CONTROVERSY.

BY JAMES TODD,

Examiner for the Protestant Educational Institute.

THE FIRST VOLUME.—GENERAL CONTENTS.

CHAPTER	I.	The Protestant Rule of Faith.
..	II.	Objections to the Protestant Rule of Faith
..	III.	(I) The Apocrypha. (II.) The Lost Books.
..	IV.	The Right of Private Judgment.
..	V.	The Romish Rule of Faith.
..	VI.	Infallibility.
..	VII.	Infallibility—continued.
..	VIII.	Infallibility: Arguments from New Testament refuted.
..	IX.	Infallibility Disproved.
..	X.	The Supremacy of Peter.
..	XI.	The Supremacy of the Pope.
..	XII.	The Papal Succession Refuted.
APPENDICES.—The Decrees of the Vatican Council in Latin and English: &c., &c., &c.		

LONDON: The Protestant Educational Institute, 38, Parliament Street, S.W.

Copies may be obtained to order by post, or otherwise, from Mr. W. T. GIBSON, at the above office.